

the tool feed (transverse) direction The Examiner admits that Medeksza does not teach reciprocating the workpiece along the transverse direction at an oscillatory rate but argues that since AAPA teaches reciprocal motion of the workpiece it would have been obvious to modify Medeksza by providing computer means for reciprocating oscillation of the workpiece. Such a combination of art does not render applicant's claim 1 or any of its dependent claims obvious.

Medeksza does not teach oscillation of anything in a direction transverse to the tool feed path. As the Examiner states, it teaches oscillation **along the tool feed path**. AAPA teaches reciprocation but nothing about oscillation superimposed on reciprocation. In combining Medeksza and AAPA, therefore, the result can only be the superimposition of Medeksza's feed path oscillation on AAPA's feed path reciprocations.

In this regard, the Examiner's misapplication of this combination is further exemplified at page 5 of the Office Action where the Examiner points out that ". . . it doesn't matter whether the tool of the workpiece moves as long as there is relative motion between the two **in the material removal direction**." Contrary to Medeksza, applicant's invention and claims are dedicated to the concept that the relative oscillatory motion is **NOT** in the material removal direction.

In this regard, the Examiner states at page 6 of the Office Action that "applicant knowingly acknowledges that the particular oscillatory direction would be obvious," citing a portion of page 10 of the specification in which the applicant indicates that oscillating action can be in the X rather than Y direction. However, this statement of applicant is directed at the prospect of the tool movement being toward the lens edge rather than the face so that the tool path is in the Y rather than X direction. Therefore the oscillatory

movement would be transverse to the tool feed movement and to the direction of removal of material.

The Examiner further rejects claims 3, 4, 5, 7 and 8 under 35 USC, Section 103 as unpatentable over Medeksza and AAPA and further in view of Dombrowski. The Examiner indicates that the reliance on Dombrowski is solely for the purpose of modifying the operation of Medeksza and AAPA with a sine wave motion. Such a combination still does not provide oscillatory motion transverse to the direction of material removal or transverse to the direction of movement of the tool as is required by applicant's claim 1 and, therefore, by the dependent claims so rejected by the Examiner.

For the above reasons, applicant reasserts that all of the claims remaining in the application are allowable and allowance of all of those claims is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

CATALANO, ZINGERMAN & ASSOCIATES, P.C.


BY: FRANK J. CATALANO
REG. NO. 25,836
810 S. CINCINNATI, SUITE 200
TULSA, OK 74119
(918) 584-8787
(918) 599-9889 (FAX)